

ATTORNEY DOCKET NO. NC18455
U.S. SERIAL NO. 09/441,271
PATENT

44. (Amended) The cover as in claim 41, wherein said cover is a fabric having threads and said indication of first electronic code is woven into said threads of said fabric.

45. (Amended) The cover as in claim 41, wherein said cover couples to said electronic book using a wireless connection.

IN THE CLAIMS

REMARKS

Regarding the Office Action dated 11/29/2002 and more specifically in Section 4, the Examiner rejected claims 41-43, 45,2, 3, 6-8, 18, 23-26, 28-37,39, 40, 9-14 and 16-17 under 35 U.S.C. 103(a) as being unpatentable over Kopp, Jr. et al. (US 5,810,604) in view of Redford et al (US 6,327,459).

Examiner states in Section 4 of the Office action, "However Redford et al teach a related electronic binder 500 which includes a front cover 511, a back cover 512, array of discrete switches including in the cover. During the mounting, a bar code pattern 521I printed on the second portion 521B is read by the identity reader 516 thereby to determine a number that identifies insert 520. It would have been obvious to a person of ordinary skill in the art at the time of the invention to utilize the code taught by Redford et al in Kopp's electronic book because this would provide a physical size, light weight, low cost and easily manufacturable electronic book.

MPEP 2143.03 states, "To establish a case of *prima facie* obviousness of a claimed invention, all claims must be taught or suggested by the prior art. Applicant asserts that neither Redford nor Kopp teach or suggest every element of claim 41 and claim 42. More specifically, Redford and Kopp do not teach or suggest the following from claim 41: "a cover containing an

ATTORNEY DOCKET NO. NC18455
U.S. SERIAL NO. 09/441,271
PATENT

indication of a second electronic code wherein when said cover is coupled with said electronic book said electronic circuitry reads said indication of second electronic code and determines if said indication of first electronic code is associated with said indication of second electronic code wherein if said indication of first electronic code is associated with said indication of said second electronic code then said electronic display is unlocked. Furthermore, regarding claim 42, neither Redford nor Kopp teach or suggest, "unlocking an electronic display on said electronic book if determined that said indication of first electronic code read from said cover is associated with said indication of second electronic code stored on said electronic book." Since not all claim limitations of claims 41 and 42 are taught or suggested the Applicant traverses the rejections of claims 41 and claim 42.

Also in Section 4 of the office action Examiner states, " As to claims 2 and 18 Redford et al teach a cover including and integrated circuit chip 41. etc. " Both claim 2 and claim 18 depend directly or indirectly from claim 41. Applicant asserts that all limitations of claim 41 are neither taught or suggested by either Redford or Kopp as required by MEP 2143.03 including phrase from claim 41, "a cover containing an indication of a second electronic code wherein when said cover is coupled with said electronic book said electronic circuitry reads said indication of second electronic code and determines if said indication of first electronic code is associated with said indication of second electronic code wherein if said indication of first electronic code is associated with said indication of second electronic code then said electronic display is unlocked. Applicant traverses the rejections of claim 2 and claim 18.

Also in Section 4 of the office action Examiner rejects claim 3 and claim 43. Since claims 3 and 43 each depend from claim 41 Applicant asserts that neither Redford nor Kopp

ATTORNEY DOCKET NO. NC18455
U.S. SERIAL NO. 09/441,271
PATENT

teach or suggest every limitation of claim 41 as described above. Applicant traverses the rejections of claims 3 and 43.

Also in Section 4 of the office action Examiner rejects claims 6-8 and 45. Since claims 6-8 and 45 each directly or indirectly depend from claim 41 Applicant reasserts that neither Redford nor Kopp teach or suggest every limitation of claim 41 as described above. Applicant traverses the rejections of claims 6-8 and 45.

In Section 5 of the office action Examiner rejects claim 23. Applicant asserts that neither Kopp nor Redford teach every limitation of claim 23 as required by MPEP 2143.03 including from claim 23, "displaying said information in said display only if said electronic code in said cover is related to said code in said information." Applicant traverses the rejection of claim 23.

Regarding claims 9-14,16 and 17 described also in Section 5 of the office action, since claims 9-14, 16 and 17 each directly or indirectly depend from claim 41 Applicant reasserts that neither Redford nor Kopp teach or suggest every limitation of claim 41 as described above.

Applicant traverses rejection of claims 9-14, 16 and 17.

Regarding the rejection of claims 24, 25, 40, 26, 28, 29-31, 33-37 and 39 described also in Section 5 of the office action, since each of these claim directly or indirectly depends from claim 23 Applicant reasserts that neither Redford nor Kopp teach or suggest every limitation of claim 23 as described above. Applicant traverses rejections of claims 24, 25, 40, 26, 28, 29-31, 33-37 and 39.

In Section 6 of the office action Examiner rejects claims 4, 5, 44 and 27 under 35 U.S.C. 103(a) as being unpatentable over Kopp et al in view of Redford et al as applied to claims 41, 42 and 23, and further in view of Post et al. Each of claims 4, 5 and 44 depend from claim 41. Applicant asserts that a case of prima facie obviousness has not been established since neither

ATTORNEY DOCKET NO. NC18455
U.S. SERIAL NO. 09/441,271
PATENT

Kopp, Redford nor Post (1997 IEEE) teaches or suggests every limitation of claim 41 including "a cover containing an indication of a second electronic code wherein when said cover is coupled with said electronic book said electronic circuitry reads said indication of second electronic code and determines if said indication of first electronic code is associated with said indication of second electronic code wherein if said indication of first electronic code is associated with said indication of second electronic code then said electronic display is unlocked." Applicant traverses the rejection of claims 4, 5 and 44.

Claim 27 also depends from claim 23. Regarding the rejection of claim 27 Applicant asserts that a case of *prima facie* obviousness has not been established since neither Kopp, Redford nor Post (1997 IEEE) teaches or suggests every limitation of claim 23 as required by MPEP 2143.03 including from claim 23, "displaying said information in said display only if said electronic code in said cover is related to said code in said information." Applicant traverses the rejection of claim 27.

In Section 7 of the office action claims 15 and 38 are rejected under 35 U.S.C. 103(a) as being unpatentable over Kopp et al in view of Redford et al as applied to claim 41 and 23, and further in view of Munyan (US 5,761,485). Claim 15 depends indirectly from claim 41.

Applicant traverses the rejection of claim 15 since neither Kopp, Redford nor Munyan teach or suggest every limitation of claim 41 as required by MPEP 2143.03 including from claim 41, "a cover containing an indication of a second electronic code wherein when said cover is coupled with said electronic book said electronic circuitry reads said indication of second electronic code and determines if said indication of first electronic code is associated with said indication of second electronic code wherein if said indication of first electronic code is associated with said indication of second electronic code then said electronic display is unlocked." Claim 38

ATTORNEY DOCKET NO. NC18455
U.S. SERIAL NO. 09/441,271
PATENT

depends indirectly from claim 23. Applicant traverses the rejection of claim 38 since neither Kopp, Redford nor Munyan teach every limitation of claim 23 as required by MPEP 2143.03 including from claim 23, "displaying said information in said display only if said electronic code in said cover is related to said code in said information."

Accordingly, re-examination and reconsideration for allowance of these claims is respectfully requested. Such early action is earnestly solicited.

Respectfully submitted,



Date: 03/31/2003

Wayne M. DeMello
Registration No. 48,601

Nokia, Inc.
Intellectual Property Rights Dept.
5 Wayside Road
Burlington, MA 01803
Telephone: (781) 993-4636
E-mail: wayne.demello@nokia.com

ATTORNEY DOCKET NO. NC18455
U.S. SERIAL NO. 09/441,271
PATENT

APPENDIX A

Amended claims, marked to show changes:

2. (Amended) The system of claim [23] 41, wherein said cover includes an integrated circuit and said indication of second electronic code is stored in said integrated circuit.
3. (Amended) The system of claim [23] 41, wherein said indication of second electronic code is embedded in said cover.
4. (Amended) The system of claim [23] 41, wherein said cover is a fabric having threads and said indication of second electronic code is woven into said threads of said fabric.
5. (Amended) The system of claim [23] 41, wherein said cover is made from paper and said indication of second electronic code is printed on said paper.
6. (Amended) The system of claim [23] 41, wherein said cover couples to said electronic book using a wireless connection.
9. (Amended) The system of claim [23] 41, wherein said cover couples to said electronic book via an electrical contact.
10. (Amended) The system of claim [23] 41, wherein said cover physically attaches to said electronic book.
11. (Amended) The system of claim [23] 41, wherein said cover physically attaches to said electronic book using Velcro TM.
12. (Amended) The system of claim [23] 41, wherein said cover physically attaches to said electronic book using conductive clasps and said cover couples to said electronic book via said conductive clasps.

ATTORNEY DOCKET NO. NC18455)
U.S. SERIAL NO. 09/441,271
PATENT

13. (Amended) The system of claim [23] 41, wherein said electronic book has a storage memory and said information is stored in said storage memory.
14. (Amended) the system of claim [23] 41, wherein said cover has a storage memory and said information is stored in said storage memory.
16. (Amended) The system of claim [23] 41, wherein said cover has a surface and displayed on said surface is material.

43. (Amended) The cover as in claim [23] 41, wherein said cover includes an integrated circuit and said indication of first electronic code is stored in said integrated circuit.
44. (Amended) The cover as in claim [23] 41, wherein said cover is a fabric having threads and said indication of first electronic code is woven into said threads of said fabric.
45. (Amended) The cover as in claim [23] 41, where in said cover couples to said electronic book using a wireless connection.